

## REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 8 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Marcelais et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the cited reference does not disclose or suggest the features of the dynamic variable specifying means or the area specifying means described in claims 1 and 11.

As discussed in the previous Amendment filed on December 16, 2003, the information processing apparatus of the present invention is directed to compiling of dynamic variables, as opposed to static variables, from a source file into an object file. Independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to more clearly describe the invention.

In programming languages, allocation of a dynamic variable to a memory area is determined when a program is executed. In order to set the contents of a dynamic variable to a predetermined value, it is necessary to know the memory area to which the dynamic variable was allocated by the operating system (OS). In the present invention, the dynamic variable specifying means specifies target dynamic variables from a source file and area specifying means specifies areas in which the dynamic variables are stored in the memory.

The Marcelais et al. reference relates to a system and method for pre-processing global variable initializers “thus eliminating the need to process (i.e. load and execute) initializers during start-up of the binary image” (see col. 4, lines 8-10). “An ‘initializer’ is a statement, function, routine, set of instructions or any other segment of computer code that is responsible for the initialization of a variable or expression” (col. 3, lines 40-42). Thus, the Marcelais et al. reference deals with issues unrelated to the problem

solved in the present invention, i.e., knowing the memory area to which the dynamic variable was allocated by the operating system (OS). Accordingly, Marcelais et al. does not disclose or suggest the claimed dynamic variable specifying means or the area specifying as described in the claims. For these reasons, independent claims 1 and 11 which both recite these features are allowable over the cited reference.

Claims 6, 7 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Marcelais et al. in view of other references of record. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the same reasons given with respect to independent claim 1, for which these claims depend.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Marcelais et al. in view of Kolawa et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for reasons claim 10 is indicated to be allowable in the Office Action. Claims 12, similar to claim 10, includes features for ensuring that areas in a memory is predetermined number of bytes more than areas declared in an array specified by the array specifying means. Accordingly, it is believed that claim 12 is also allowable over the cited references.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. The Examiner should contact Applicants' undersigned attorney if a telephone conference would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



B. Joe Kim

Registration No. 41,895

June 16, 2004

Suite 2500  
300 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 360-0080  
Customer No. 24978